



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of smaller proportions. On the second meuble are seen the seasons, forming a bas-relief; garlands of flowers and fruit ornament the corners, while on the extreme top Jupiter, in green bronze, surmounts a figure, in gilded bronze, of Fortune. There is nothing outside of the Louvre that can at all compare with these two well-known specimens of the artist's skill. A full-sized marble bust of a youth with half-closed eyelids standing near by is attributed to Donatello. In any case it is remarkable both for the elevation of style and the simple grandeur of its drawing. An enormous marble chimney, taken from the Château de Moutal, and dating from the sixteenth century, is placed in one corner. Here and there stand glass-cases containing as much treasure as their limited space affords, tempting one to a lingering inspection; the odd bits of Venetian, Roman, Spanish, and Flemish art pass unnoticed amid the more appealing size and tangibility of the large pieces of known and reputed value. The case of costumes would alone be worth days of study; from the finely cut white kid dress, looking like dainty lace, worn by Essex when beheaded, down to the costume of the Infante, one might study history with text-book in hand and picture illustration of intrinsic worth.

"This entire dwelling represents the study, the reflection, and the acquired knowledge of a lifetime. Undoubtedly M. Goupil threw out, as his opportunities increased, the nullities of first selections. Living daily in his museum, seeing every moment, as all artists must see, the needs and necessities of their home picture, he replaced little by little the vacancies, he corrected the errors, and toned down the coloring. There is only one echo here when you mention this studio which I have simply attempted to suggest. 'Ah! cela!' and then profound silence asserts the undebatable logic of perfection. Moreover, the habitation has one great quality, that with all its value, the constantly growing richness of its collected works of art, it looks like a home, it is restful—as if the loving, tender touch of the master required just such surroundings to bring out that inner vital spirit of unostentatious culture which educates and tempers the horizon of daily life beyond the toil and bread-earning necessity of the usual existence."

JEWISH ARTISTS AND CHRISTIAN SUBJECTS.

DISRAELI said that the best bargains in crucifixes were to be made with Jewish art dealers, and a well-known painting by Vibert—recently shown at the Union League Club—represents one of these dealers offering for sale to a scoffing knot of gorgeously robed ecclesiastics what presumably is a finely carved ivory effigy of Jesus. From being mere traders in crucifixes, as a matter of business, it is interesting, as a sign of the liberal tendencies of the times, to note that Jews—who now, for the first time in their history, appear as painters and sculptors—show a decided liking for New Testament subjects introducing the gracious figure of the founder of Christianity. This, probably, is not because they are any nearer conversion to a creed which, for centuries, has been to them only a synonym for ruthless cruelty and persecution, but because now, in the clear light of the nineteenth century, they can calmly and reverently regard Him as the noble Israelite whom all the civilized people on the earth but themselves, have hitherto been proud to honor.

We have said, that now, for the first time in the history of the race, it has representatives in painting and sculpture. In regard to the latter, perhaps, this assertion is not wholly accurate. That the emancipated Hebrews from Egypt had some knowledge of sculpture appears evident from the passage in Exodus about the golden apsis, which represents Aaron to have "formed (the

gold) with a graver's tool, and made it a molten calf," and the Hebrew word "char-rawt" signifies "to engrave." In fact, all the arts and trades practised in Egypt were in the hands of the slaves, inasmuch as the upper classes considered every occupation, save that of a soldier, beneath their dignity. But, with the exception of the apsis and the brazen serpent, no mention is made in the Hebrew Bible of any artistic work—excepting embroidery, in which they excelled—performed by the Israelites. The carving for Solomon's temple appears to have been done by the Phœnicians, subjects of Hiram. In fact, the Hebrews were not allowed to have in their hands an iron tool when raising an altar, on account of their idolatrous propensities consequent to their long

typify the Divine Presence; they were symbols of Omnipotence and Omniscience—the divine attributes—and not representatives of actual beings. Besides which they were dual. A single figure might have suggested an idol; but *two*, especially, when representing something greater than themselves, could not do so.

The Mohammedans were subject to the same Mosaic law against making "any graven image or any likeness of anything, etc.," and they admitted the same rigorous construction as to its application. The more modern reading of the commandment is that one shall not make the "image" or "likeness" to "bow down to it and worship it;" but orthodox Jew and Mohammedan alike disregarded the qualification contained in the succeeding

clause just quoted. As the student of Oriental art is aware, the Moslem artisan has, for centuries, evaded the strict application of the law as set forth in the Koran; but it is only in this half of the present century, under the relaxing hold of rabbinical tradition on the conscience of the Jew, that the latent artistic instinct which hitherto found vent in the poetry of a Heine or the music of a Mendelssohn has asserted itself in the painting of an Israels and the sculpture of an Antokolski. The name of the one is widely known as that of "the Dutch Millet," and that of the second as the winner of the gold medal for sculpture at the International Exposition in Paris, in 1878. As with Mendelssohn, the Jew, might be grouped Halevy, Meyerbeer, Ernst, Joachim, Goldstück and Rubenstein, so with Israels might be linked the names of Emile and Henri Levy, Jules Worms and Meyerheim, who, while not so famous as the great Hollander, hold creditable rank among modern painters. It would be easy to add a long list of French, German, English and American artists of the same race, if it were necessary to show that the disposition among the Jews of to-day to pursue the study of the graphic arts is not confined to a few familiar names. But our present purpose is, particularly, to call attention to Jewish artists who have chosen subjects from the New Testament for chisel or brush. First in rank of these is the Russian Antokolski, whose "Jesus Before the People," is a superb work. Both the Levys named are known for their paintings of scriptural subjects, Emile for decorative work in the church of the Trinity, in Paris, and Henri for his "Herodias," "The Crucifixion" and "Christ in the Tomb." In this country a Jewish painter of such subjects is Mr. Frank Moss, of Philadelphia, whose "Resurrection of Jairus' Daughter" and "Christ in the Temple," illustrated herewith by sketches by the artist, were shown in the Salons of 1880 and 1881, and were presented by Mr. Thouron, of Philadelphia, to the cathedral of that city, where they now hang in the west transept, one on each side of the large entrance doors. His "Jesus" is of a more refined type than that of Antokolski, of which a French critic has justly remarked that, with all its grand simplicity, "il y a un peu de moujik." But it was not left for a Jewish artist to depart from the traditional representation in



"CHRIST BEFORE THE PEOPLE." STATUE IN MARBLE BY ANTOKOLSKI.

residence in Egypt (see Exodus xx. 21, 22). The law of Moses forbade the making of "any graven image of anything in the heavens above or on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth." In view of this command, one is tempted to ask, how are we to account for the seraphim and the cherubim used in the decoration of the tabernacle. The answer given is that the seraphim were an order of celestial beings beheld only in prophetic vision or dream, and nowhere else mentioned in the Bible; and that the cherubim were so purely symbolical that even the heathens could not mistake them for idolatrous images. Josephus remarks (Antiquities iii. vi. 5.) that they resembled no animals that were ever seen by man, and that no man in his day knew their form. The cherubim apparently were intended to

which, perhaps, there is something more than a suggestion of the beauty of the Sun god of the Greeks. The finely chiselled Hellenic features, the blonde hair and the delicate physique, with which certain of the old masters have long taught us to associate the conception of Jesus, are seldom reproduced by the painter of to-day. Munkacsy, Doré and Holman Hunt have all substituted a refined Hebraic type. The earliest portraits known of the founder of Christianity represent Him as "the man of sorrows," deformed, and dark, and uncomely of visage. While, happily, the tendency of the painters of to-day is not to revive this unattractive Byzantine ideal, it is certainly in the direction of the realistic as opposed to the more poetically beautiful creation, which was never justified by history.